

7+SP-SDS-History... General

Buehler - file -

BACKGROUND PAPERS # 1, 2 & 3

Summer Institute
of the
STUDENT LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
MADISON, WISC.
JULY 7 - 13, 1958

Contents

Kennan: Excerpts from Russia, The Atom and the West

Schiffrin: The Americanization of Politics

Sheingorn: Excerpts from an Article in the 'Vassar Miscellany'

STUDENT LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY
112 East 19 Street
New York 3, N. Y.

What are the things we worry about in my own country?
There are many of them. It is hard to find any logical order to put them in. We worry over all the characteristic phenomena of industrialism and urbanization. We worry about what the machine does to man--about what becomes of creativity and imagination and the sense of independent achievement in the man who works at the lathe. We worry about what is happening to our great urban area--about the disintegration of our cities as communities under the impact of the automobile. We worry about our youth--about the depression of educational standards through the huge new influx of children, far more than we can cope with, into our schools. We worry about the effects of television and passive recreation of all kinds on the minds of young people, and on their capacity for creative enjoyment. We worry about the juvenile delinquency in our great cities; about what happens to the child when both parents work and he is left to seek companionship and appreciation and the sense of adventure in the life of the streets. We worry, in the case of our older student generation, about what seems to us to be their exaggerated demand for security, their lack of the spirit of adventure--even of protest--their interest in knowledge for utilitarian purposes rather than for its own sake. Some of us worry, finally, about the phenomenon of "bigness" in government: about this appalling proliferation of bureaucracy, and what it does to government itself; to the ease of communication within it, to the capacity for insight, the incisiveness of decision, the humanity of approach, and the style of leadership.

We worry about the creeping inflation that has characterized our economy ever since the crisis; and we puzzle as to how we can combine a system in which no one needs to work at a job he doesn't like with the financial discipline requisite to protecting the savings of a growing population of old people, pensioners and people on fixed incomes. We worry about finding the right proportion between the amount of our national product to devote to defense against outside encroachment, and the amount that is to go into the normal development of our economy. We worry about the exhaustion of our natural resources and the blighting of our landscape by the headlong industrialization on which we are embarked. We worry, finally, and a great deal in fact, about our color problem, which has torn our life to pieces once, and can do so again.

. . . Is there, by chance, an impression here that whereas England's star is on the decline, we Americans are a dynamic, coming nation, lucky beyond our deserts, riding the wave of the future, moving into the glories of world dominion? To judge by recent trends, this is hardly the case. We are rapidly becoming a highly conservative welfare state, psychologically sufficient unto ourselves, largely committed--as I have just suggested--to the maintenance of over-employment in the name of social security, to a creeping inflation which we seem to have no serious intention of combatting, to a growing dependence on the

resources of others, and to the cultivation of a comfortable life at home.

. . . I wish only to demonstrate that life in America is a great struggle among the characteristic forces of the modern age, and that you, whether you like it or not, are parties to this struggle. You are not alone in your distaste for certain American phenomena. You have millions of allies in these feelings, among Americans themselves. Nor are these phenomena exclusively American. Let us recognize our bond and move forward against ostentation and vulgarity and intolerance wherever these things are to be found, not charging each other with their authorship but accepting them as a common problem.

Andre Schiffrin: Americanization of Politics*

"Americanization" is a term used by some Europeans to denote the lowering of standards which they consider to be desirable. Hence, the growing influence of commercialism on radio and TV broadcasting is known not as "Luxemburgization" but as "Americanization." Likewise, the continuous vulgarizing of the popular press is called "Americanization" and not "Anglicization." And so forth.

This practice would be harmless enough were it not used to suggest that this deterioration has been imposed from abroad and is in no way native to the countries involved. Unfortunately, the rapid growth of this process in certain countries shows that it fits in all too well with the mores and values of these lands.

A look at "Americanization" however, can be useful if it is seen as a universal process, coming at specific times in the development of a nation. The symptoms of the disease can be seen in a large number of countries in a variety of fields. Recently, the newspapers have informed us of yet another area of contagion. The patient in this case was Germany, the area politics.

Both parties had prepared for the 1957 elections for some time, but the Christian Democrats had had the wisdom of sending an expert to study American methods. The trip was fruitful and as the campaign evolved an endless stream of new gimmicks came from the CDU office. Perhaps most striking, and most American, were a million posters which were plastered all over the country a few days before the vote. Simple portraits of the CDU leaders, highlighting the kind grandfatherly face of the Chancellor occupied the walls of Germany. Accompanying the portraits would be an occasional one line slogan, the favorite being "No experiments--Vote CDU."

The tactics worked, the CDU was re-elected with a most impressive majority and the political analysts announced to their publics that the virus had spread.

There were, of course, a great many reasons for Adenauer's victory. But there were others which suggested that at least the opposition should have made a better showing. The German Socialist Party (SPD) is, after all, one of the largest mass Labor parties in the world. Its membership is the largest in Germany; it has trade union backing and a long history of militant class-conscious backing. It was not "Americanization" that won the battle for the CDU but the reasons for it--these can be seen to explain both the SPD's defeat and, in part, why the American Democrats have been defeated these last years.

An examination of current American domestic politics, therefore, could offer

*Originally published in Granta, literary magazine at Cambridge University.

some insights on what can be expected in the European countries now undergoing "Americanization." The study of advance cases has, at times, been useful in the preparation of antidotes. Perhaps certain of the symptoms will prove useful warnings.

Probably the most striking aspect of Western European politics today is material prosperity. And the USA has been more prosperous for a longer time than any of the nations outside the Western Hemisphere. There can be no gainsaying this prosperity; acknowledging this is the most important first step. For years after the war many Americans, and not merely those on the left, were persuaded that it would not last. But the lessons of Keynes and government spending were not set aside when the war ended. As a result, more Americans were better off than they had ever been and the tendency not to think about politics and to accept the status quo grew with each election.

This prosperity, in the USA, in England and in Western Europe, has set the tone of political conflict. The "givens" have changed and in general those wishing to preserve the status quo have been quick to realize this. The Conservatives, the Republicans, the Christian Democrats - for the first time in years have been able to take the offensive and feel that they could win genuine popular majorities. The reformers, on the other hand, Socialist, Laborite or Democrat have, on the whole, found themselves in the same defensive position. They have all had their chance in office, their first reforms have been carried through and have thus become part of the status quo. As reformist parties, they feel uncomfortable defending the status quo, even if it is partly of their own making.

This, then, can be taken as the general situation needed for the appearance of the first symptoms of "Americanization." With most people well off, it may be expected that they will be much less interested in changing the status quo or even examining it more carefully. Most Americans know only the exact size of their own share of the national income; they are unaware that 80% of them earn only as much as the top 20%. More important, they are not particularly interested in this and will not, as the past years have shown, protest loudly when legislation is introduced which primarily lessens the tax burden of the top twenty per cent.

This situation would not be so serious were it not for the fact that a large number of Americans have not reached the level of prosperity which it is assumed everyone possesses. Practically the bottom fifth of the population (some 30 million individuals) live on salaries insufficient to meet what is a very modest standard of living, even by American standards (as set by the government's Bureau of Labor Statistics).

When the majority's prosperity is threatened, then all have a definite interest in acting with the poorest in obtaining remedies which will help all. But in times of prosperity, where is the political advantage in reminding people of the farm workers, poorer white-collar workers, pensioners and others who have somehow been left out? There are still migrant workers living much as those described by Steinbeck. But it would be considered very demode, very 1930ish to speak of them. Like the social novel, such appeals are considered a part of the past.

Thus we may see as the second symptom of "Americanization" a lack of information about concern for those who have been left out of the new prosperity. The Conservative parties can refer to those unfortunates as freakish "exceptions" to the mysterious rules of neo-capitalist economics. Those parties of the Left which had depended on the economic dissatisfaction of large majorities to put them into power now find that they may have reformed themselves into a minority - and that unless they are able to formulate a new appeal, they will simply have to wait around for the next depression.

If people are unconcerned about the relative size of their share in the nation's wealth, one might at least expect that they would be interested in controlling its distribution. But this interest too seems to have disappeared with prosperity. Once again, the problem is seen most graphically in America which has, after all, no nationalized industries. America's wealth is owned under a capitalist system. Although it is under considerable government control and relies on even more considerable government subsidies, this system is based on private ownership of the nation's wealth for the sake, ultimately of private profit.

It is obvious that the present wealth of the United States has been produced largely through the workings of this system (and it is beyond the scope of this article to argue how greater prosperity might be produced through alternative methods.) One should not expect Americans to discuss nationalization - even during the depression this word was anathema to most politicians. But one might expect some discussion of who controls all of this wealth. Most Americans are given the impression by the nation's mass media that they are a nation of stockholders and therefore that all benefit directly from the workings of this system. In fact, only 4.2 per cent of all Americans own even a fraction of a share in any of the limited corporations. And of these a much smaller percentage controls the vast majority of shares.

Yet the political silence is such that this is never discussed - nor any of the implications of such a concentration of power. To what degree can political democracy - without even mentioning economic or social democracy - function properly when such immense power is beyond public control? At what point does control of this power become private corporate control of the state? What are the effects on the nation's economy of such profit-centered direction; not to mention the effect on the daily lives of millions - that they work for powers which must ultimately treat them as secondary to their profit? Neither the system nor the implications are questioned - the apathy is thereby compounded.

A similar situation has been observable in several nations in recent years. Trial balloons have been seen in Germany, where the Chancellor recently proposed the dismantling of the significant experiment in non-profit manufacturing, the Volkswagon (public) corporation. Likewise, Hr. Krupp's failure to live up to his solemn pledges and dismantle an empire built partly on slave labor has shown in the most ominous way what can happen when society refuses to ask who is controlling what.

But obviously the most striking parallel for the British has been the recent debates in the Labor Party. Of course, the recent conclusions have partly stemmed from a most laudable desire to reappraise the whole process of nationalization. The jettisoning of such dogmatic panaceas is an excellent sign. But it is a big step from this to the argument that the state should limit itself to minority shareholdings, lest it find itself in control of more economic power - although such democratic control (not necessarily through nationalization) is ostensibly a basic socialist aim. We may list as high among the symptoms of "Americanization" this shift of political debate. The public can only rarely dictate to private holders of capital and many policies will be considered outside the proper area of political scrutiny. The democratization of economic control, the role of workers' representation in management, experiments in basic industrial democracy - all of these questions must also be forgotten. And with them, the possibility of vital if nonmaterial alterations of economic life, the introduction of some control by men of the tools which dominate so much of their lives.

One additional symptom of "Americanization" may be added to the two which we have chosen so far, and that is the role of the mass media in this domestic political arena. The effects of debased media on a large population with an increasing amount of leisure should first, however, be relegated to that vast limbo - beyond the scope of this article. Of primary concern here is the role of these media in cultivating the euphoric acceptance of the status quo and in concealing those political realities which might somehow disturb the public. The facts which have been cited above are all a matter of public record, there is no conspiracy to make them unavailable to the interested citizen. But the disparity between them and the general impression held by the overwhelming majority of people is neither accidental nor due to the general ignorance which one must expect on most political issues. Let us take but two examples.

There is no national health scheme in the USA, nor is there likely to be one for years. Yet only half of the American people are even partially covered by voluntary health plans. But few are the congressmen or newspapers who would speak in favor of the very minimal plans that have hitherto been proposed. Part of the answer to this seeming paradox is the \$10,000,000 propaganda fund compulsorily levied from its members by the American Medical Association. Every method of propaganda, from brochure to articles planted in magazines is used to persuade the American public that national health insurance is somehow basically un-American.

A more graphic example is shown in the full page ads run in most major American periodicals by the electric power companies. Much to their distress, a recent opinion poll had shown that a majority of Americans felt that electric power should be publicly owned. Consulting their experts, the companies started a series of advertisements (tax exemptable as business expenses) one of which showed a bloody clawed hand hovering menacingly above the angelic heads of two sleeping infants. The message: public ownership would threaten their future and deprive Americans of such basic rights as freedom of religion

With this as part of the background of one's everyday life, the oft described tactics used in election campaigns seem but logical outgrowths--and recent German elections only aped the less harmful aspects of the manoeuvres which have been so well dubbed the "engineering of consent."

The mass media have, however, been used for yet another task which, in the long run may prove the most pernicious. Politicians may successfully appeal to the most selfish of motives, but there still lurks in most men some remnants of a conscience that demands to be appeased. And so justifications of present policies are churned out--assuring all that this is the best of all possible worlds. A certain amount of this can be expected of all politicians, a great deal more has come as a result of having a well meaning President, all too frequently unable to implement his wishes. But there is a certain hypocrisy, our last symptom, which goes beyond this.

In spite of the fact that 'Progress' is even more demode than the social novel, it seems to be an important trade mark of "Americanization." In the USA, this is partly based on an optimism which is one of America's finest characteristics. It is also based on an understandable reluctance to consider the horrors which in recent years have given the lie to the theory of inevitability of progress. But there is a difference between a morbid obsession with the sins of this century and a refusal to act as if we were living in it. The continuous assurance that there is nothing wrong, that we are acting as we should and that any temporary set-backs can be arranged by speeding technological progress--these are the most dangerous of illusions and myths.

In simple day to day terms it permits the illusion of morality to an American President who calls on all to make sacrifices in times of emergency and then presents a budget which does not rescind excess profit tax slashes but does cut down on the appropriations for the blind. It is a view so obsessed with material prosperity that those in want seem somehow, beings of another sort relegated to the occasional mercies of charity. It is a snare which permits a Congress to approve annual subsidies of millions for private profit while boggling endlessly on a pittance for the relief of millions who are in dire want throughout the world. It is these myths which permit us to compound social injustice while speaking of our own goodness.

Such acts of hubris are perhaps the most terrible consequences of this politics of prosperity, which isolates those who have from those in want, which furthers the separation of men already so alienated from one another.

Political problems should hold, somehow within them, the clue to their own solution and in describing the symptoms of this disease some of the answers have perhaps been hinted at. The present defensive positions in which the parties of the democratic left now find themselves may well prove a boon for them within the next years.

They have to a large degree, been forced to relinquish appeals to gain individualistic prosperity to those who can best exploit them, the Conservatives. In so doing, more and more have been forced to return to the basic ethical and religious forces which have been at the base of so many of the parties of reform; even those which in Western Europe (such as the SPD and SPO) have clung tenaciously to the dubious garments of scientific socialism.

In the United States, where the Democratic Left has been on the defensive for a good many years, there has been the beginning of such a reappraisal, and similar re-evaluations can be seen in the Democratic Socialist and Labor parties in the rest of the world. In many respects, these parties have found themselves in ideological conditions similar to those in which they were created.

There is indeed, an element of the humerous or even pathetic in the position of those on the Left who have to stir a public as apathetic as that of Victorian times. The percentage of those "submerged" has decreased, but the parallels to those earlier days are numerous.

Faced with the symptoms of "Americanization": a relatively prosperous majority largely disinterested in the lot of others or in the problems not directly affecting their material well being, continuously bombarded with assurances of the correctness of their position, the parties now in the opposition have a task which defies most of their old solutions. Harking back to their original reasons for existence, they must reassert the basic meaning of democracy and social justice in terms which will force a re-opening of the political debate.

Until such a time, however, we can expect to see the increased "Americanization" of European politics. The terrain seems ready. It was a French Prime Minister, after all, who first defined politics as the art, not of answering basic questions, but of quieting those who ask them.

Carol Sheingorn: From an article in the Vassar Miscellany.

The term "younger generation" suggests a number of things to me, but as I try to derive a definition from these, I am left with one concept: those who wait. The "silent" generation, the "younger" generation, my generation is one which does not yet feel social responsibility or social privilege; it feels neither the satisfactions nor frustrations of maturity; it feels, as it has been taught, a sense of preparing to bear the weight of a perplexed and populated world. This is to me my generation, and in this, a comment on the "silent" generation and an answer to "The Unsilent Generation." I speak for myself and for those who agree with me.

My generation is struggling with something rather new in Western Civilization. It is trying desperately to know itself in a way that Socrates did not perhaps intend. It has been forced to an awareness of the subconscious mind, an awareness of the personal motivation behind the social ideal. It is facing in newly complex terms the problem of determinism and moral responsibility, trying to know itself in an age when the self and the determining pressures on the self seem inseparable. It must deal with a new value superimposed upon an old one; natural and unblocked, mentally and emotionally healthy, it must also be Good.

We are empirical in our attempt to know ourselves--an attempt characteristically adolescent to be sure, but now with more yardsticks than ever before. We try to act and observe, and the more locally we act, the more restricted our areas of action, the more accurately we can record our processes and the effects of our movement. We generalize and apply our principles in our own situations. We can more easily try to reform Vassar than Russia, more easily see the effect of a letter to a co-op board than a missive to Eisenhower. The closer the relation between our principled commitment and its result, the more meaningful for us, for the more we can learn from it.

Sometimes the action is highly personal and socially insignificant, and sometimes it is blatant and seemingly irresponsible rebellion, for each tests his wings and flies as he can, and falls as he will. And sometimes as in the case of the three-eyed Princeton seniors, we make the tragic mistake of giving up the tests, confusing passivity with maturity, and defensive and inexperienced stoicism with wisdom.

. . . It is true that we did not know the Depression, and that we scarcely knew the war. We never met the cousins who died in the gas chambers, and Anne Frank is someone who kept a journal. There are many who insist that we have known only security and prosperity--as if they could somehow be equated. These people are wrong; they cannot see the horror inside us, or the protest which underlies all our lives. But we will not give our lives in Hungary. They are our only tools; our only weapons, at once the most and least we can give. And so we sit, and watch ourselves grow, waiting for our turn on the seesaw.

Summer Institute
Student League for Industrial Democracy
Wisconsin Memorial Union, July 7-13, 1958

The aim of this Institute is to arrive at a clearer notion of the direction in which we want our society to move. We make two working assumptions--assumptions which are nevertheless not beyond question:

First, the impulse to social reform which has given so much strength to our movement in the past is not dead, just dormant.

Second, that this impulse sleeps is due to a complex of factors; such as a sense of the futility of any social action in an age of bewildering acceleration, and a confusion concerning what in our society needs to be reformed or changed.

The concrete result of the Institute will be a preliminary assessment in the form of a printed statement of:

1) Some of the unhappy aspects of our present society as well as those aspects with which we rest content.

2) The ethics which such discontents and satisfactions seem to imply.

3) The more fundamental aspects of present social organization which produce discontents.

4) Possible new directions for a social reform movement.

5) The validity of past and present liberal and socialist thought.

6) The role of the S.L.I.D. in the movement we want to build.

Of course, we cannot hope in a week's time to make anything approaching a definitive statement about these questions. But we can and should make such a statement one of the S.L.I.D.'s longer-term goals. The proceedings of this Institute will be published as a first step in that direction.

There will be two kinds of sessions: (1) several workshop discussions in the general area of the problems outlined above and (2) discussion programs on specific issues, designed to stimulate thinking about more general concerns.

PROGRAM AND SCHEDULE

Monday, July 7

Morning and afternoon: Registration in the Union

8 P.M. Films: "How Green Was My Valley" "The River" . Discussion will follow.

Tuesday, July 8

3:30 P.M. Sidney Hertzberg, Executive Director, League for Industrial Democracy.
"THE FUTURE OF THE LIBERAL MOVEMENT" (first workshop discussion)

8 P.M. Leslie A. Fiedler, Professor of English, Montana State University; Critic, Contributor, New Leader, Encounter, etc.
"HOW YOUNG IS THE YOUNGER GENERATION"?

Wednesday, July 9

3:30 P.M. Mark Starr, Education Director, International Ladies Garment Workers Union.
"THE ECONOMICS AND ETHICS OF PROSPERITY" (second workshop disc.)

7:30 P.M. Joint session with the Training Institute of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.
"PROBLEMS OF LABOR AND MANAGEMENT IN UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES"
Jones Hall

Thursday, July 10

3:30 P.M. Selig Perlman, Professor of Economics, University of Wisconsin.
"SOURCES OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL POWER"

8 P.M. Michael Petrovich, Professor of History, University of Wisc.
"DOES RUSSIA REALLY WANT PEACE" (a discussion)

Friday, July 11

3:30 P.M. Agnes Douty, American Civil Liberties Union.
"THE LIBERALS AND INTEGRATION" (third workshop discussion)

8 P.M. Hans H. Gerth, Professor of Sociology, University of Wisconsin.
"POLITICAL ACTION AND THE DYNAMICS OF SOCIAL CHANGE" (fourth workshop discussion)

Saturday, July 12

9:30 A.M. Jack Barbash, School for Workers, University of Wisconsin
Harold M. Groves, Professor of Economics, University of Wisc.
"UNION DEMOCRACY AND SOCIAL REFORM" (panel discussion)

2 P.M. Fifth Workshop Discussion: Summary of the results.
"WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE"?

8:30 P.M. Party for conference participants. Place to be announced.

A Brief Introduction to
THE STUDENT LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY (SLID)

It is difficult to describe any organization in one page—even more difficult when that organization has meant a great many things to tens of thousands over some 50 years. It is easier to describe what SLID does, who its members are and what people have said about it. Perhaps only in this way could we avoid either platitudes or clichés.

Perhaps the best way to explain the uniqueness in SLID is to look back over the years of its history. SLID was started to be a Fabian Society within an American context. Like its British counterpart, SLID was not meant to be dogmatic, committed to one answer or sworn to one party or panacea. The organization was based on a faith in the efficacy of pragmatic research and education to find the best answers for the problems which have always plagued mankind.

Over the years the questions which SLID has sought to answer have changed. In 1905 men like Jack London and Upton Sinclair were interested in the nature of the social revolution which they felt was bound to come. In the thirties, men like Paul Douglas and Walter Reuther sought to find a way to preserve and expand democracy in the face of what seemed to be a complete collapse of the traditional American system. Throughout the last half century the L.I.D. has taken the ideas of these men—and of others like John Dewey, Norman Thomas and Walter Lippmann—and sought to find what answers were the most relevant to the problems of each new era.

But SLID realizes that there is a certain bias inherent in the questions which it asks. SLID is troubled about questions which may seem already answered to many, such as: who should control our nation's basic resources, is anyone responsible for the millions who live beneath the minimum required by human decency, how can the individual maintain his civil liberties in view of increased government power, who should control the new economic powers vested in governments—no matter what the social system may be, what is our responsibility towards the underdeveloped areas, can democracy survive in nations with uneducated populations, should production be for private profit or the public weal, who will do the planning required in a mass production era, etc. etc. etc.

And having asked these questions, SLID admits a further bias in the answers which it is willing to consider. For everything having to do with power threatens the delicate balance of democracy. How can new steps be taken which increase economic, social and political democracy—without unduly tipping the balance in one direction. Throughout the years SLID has realized that it is not enough to deplore fascism, racism, bolshevism or any other manifestation of tyranny. There is a need for a positive democratic program which can answer the legitimate needs which these new ideologies recognize.

It would be wrong to suggest that SLID is merely composed of college students posing basic questions and searching for eternal truths. In its research, discussion, publications—in every aspect of its multifaceted program of education, SLID seeks practical answers to questions of social relevancy. But it does so in light of certain ethical and religious criteria. Since SLID does not campaign, back candidates or legislation it can afford to look at underlying factors, seek to take the long view, dare to maintain principles when compromise has gone too far. For this reason SLID looks at all solutions which are compatible with a faith in democracy—no matter how unpopular they may seem at the time.

Thus in an era which has been marked by a certain complacency and a return to a "new conservatism", SLID has not been lacking issues to discuss. Beneath the placidity of "progress and prosperity" SLID recognizes many problems which have hitherto gone unanswered. Automation, atomic power, the new nationalism, economic planning, completing the welfare state, exploring new methods of social ownership and control, examining the basis of education and communication in a mass society—these are but some of the questions which SLID is currently exploring.

In joining SLID one joins a tradition which is unique in many ways—it is a tradition of reform, which sees reform as one means to an end; an end which may never be attained, yet which must be sought if we are to remain true to our heritage as democrats. Whitehead has said that the standard of a nation is the level of its dreams. It is SLID's belief that America can not remain complacent in a moving world; that democracy is still the most dynamic political force in the marketplace of ideas—and that it can become an even more powerful faith once its economic and social implications are explored.

WHAT DOES SLID (THE STUDENT LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY) DO?

Though SLID is America's oldest campus liberal organization, its meaning for today's student depends on its current activities. SLID can be true to its past traditions and meaningful for the future only in what it is doing today.

SLID, however, will always be composed of the same type of student; past chapter chairmen like Senator Paul Douglas, Walter Reuther or Walter Lippmann have been replaced by others who have an abiding faith in the promise of democracy. Whether they call themselves socialists or progressive moderates, liberals or independents, SLID members are united in what John Dewey, the L.I.D.'s late President called a belief in "a democracy that shall be a living reality in every aspect and reach of our common life".

On the attached page you will see some of the points for which SLID and L.I.D. stand. This statement is not a credo to which all members must adhere; but it may serve to give you an idea of the direction in which SLID is interested. For the lack of dogmas, of a doctrinaire attitude is as important to SLID as the basic ethical and moral stand approach which gives meaning to its experiment in "education for increasing democracy in our economic, political and social life".

What, then, does SLID do to implement these ideas--or are they only theory? Though SLID does not partake in political action, its educational program is unique in scope and content and has given SLID and its parent organization, the League for Industrial Democracy, their vital pioneering role during the past fifty year of America's political, economic and social development.

INTERNATIONALLY - SLID works for expanding democracy in the halls of the U.N., at international conferences and through extensive liaison with democratic youth throughout the world. Through its affiliation with IUSY (International Union of Socialist Youth) and WAY (World Assembly of Youth), SLID is able to wage a positive battle against the totalitarian right and left.

HEMISPHERICALLY - SLID, however, does not neglect its closer neighbors and it has developed an exceptional program within the hemisphere. It has exchanged visits and information with progressive Canadian Youth through its cooperation with the youth and student groups of the CCF (Cooperative Commonwealth Federation-Canada's farmer-labor party). Recently, SLID has helped initiate a special committee on student rights in Latin America and is embarking on a program of education and exchange, in defence of democracy throughout the hemisphere.

INTER-ORGANIZATIONALLY - In addition to the above, SLID works with all the major student and youth groups in the U.S. through the co-ordinating Young Adult Council. It has recently started educational cooperation with the Students for Democratic Action and is always willing to work in this field with democratic youth and student groups.

NATIONALLY - Numerous projects issue from the SLID National Office. These include an annual Spring conference whose recent topics have included "Conformity and Dissent" and "Patterns of Reform in North America". Each Summer SLID has a special leadership training institute; it joins with Canadian students in an annual Winter School and has an annual convention in which members plan new programs of democratic education.

In addition to this SLID prepares numerous radio broadcasts, does special research and acts as an information center on youth affairs. SLID's publications include its newsletter, the SLID VOICE, a new Intercollegiate Review, THE MONITOR, and a series of student-written Research Tracts which have received international acclaim for original research in fields ranging from Income Distribution and Subsidization of the Arts to the Worker Priest experiment.

ON THE CHAPTER LEVEL - SLID chapters follow the SLID "method" in that they follow no fixed path but seek to bring something new and important to their respective campuses. At some, such as Yale and Wisconsin, SLID public meetings are the main campus attraction; others, such as Harvard or Chicago, prefer smaller discussion and research groups. U.S. students abroad, such as a group at the London School of Economics, have even set up chapters to help give their fellow students a clearer picture of America's political scene.

Whether in chapters or as members at large, SLID members participate in all national activities and in addition benefit from L.I.D. projects, especially the L.I.D. pamphlets which are received by all SLID members.

The above can only serve to give you an idea of what SLID does - for more information use the blank provided.

—PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE THROUGH THE STUDENT LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

In addition to publishing its own studies, newsletters and magazines, SLID supplies a large number of specialized studies from other organizations. SLID members receive four of the LID's previous publications upon joining and thereafter are also mailed the LID's quarterly bulletin and all new LID publications. Pamphlets listed below, however, may be obtained by the general public.

FREE PAMPHLETS—These publications are available free of charge to all members of SLID or to any person purchasing at least one LID or SLID pamphlet. However, no more than one copy of each work listed is allowed per person.

The ABC of Parliamentary Law—A handy guide published by the ILGWU for its members.

America's Struggle for Electric Power—An account of early attempts at securing public power. 44 pp.

Communism's Post War Decade—This study of Soviet strength as seen through the world's Communist parties was prepared by Radio Free Europe for the Tamiment Inst.

Creeping Socialism vs. Limping Capitalism—An illustrated, introductory criticism of big business propaganda by the Education Director of the ILGWU.

Education and the Social Order—Some proposals for educational reform by John Dewey.

Labor Governments at Work—What the Socialists accomplished when they attained office in Scandinavia, England, Australia and New Zealand.

Russia—Democracy or Dictatorship—Norman Thomas' and Joel Seidman's analysis of Soviet totalitarianism in 1939 is of definite historical interest.

Partnership for Freedom—A study of foreign aid and trade prepared by the top international experts of the Americans for Democratic Action. Well documented.

—L.I.D. Publications for Sale—

Studies of Labor in the U.S.

Forward March of American Labor—Over 100,000 copies of this introduction to labor history have been sold in recent years. 32pp. 15¢

The Taft-Hartley Act in Action—A leading labor expert, Jack Barbash, compares this law with the Wagner Act and makes a thorough appraisal of the T-H Act. 48pp. 25¢

Labor Looks at Education—The Harvard Inglis lecture by Mark Syarr, Vice-President of the LID and the nation's most noted labor educator. 52pp. 50¢

Toward a Farmer Labor Party—Dr. H.W. Laidler, the LID's Exec. Director, examines the background of independent political alliances in the U.S. 55pp. 15¢.

Down on the Farm—A pioneering examination of the plight of agricultural labor as well as a penetrating criticism of current farm policies. 8 1/2 x 11. 14pp. 25¢

A Program for Labor and Progressives—Plan for reform as expressed in 1946 by a cross section of labor leaders, liberals and democratic socialists. 48pp. 25¢

Public Services

The TVA and its Critics—A defence of TVA by its former Chairman, Gordon Clapp. 10¢, 12¢

A Housing Program for America—One of the countries most respected housing authorities outlines a program for decent housing for all. 32pp. 25¢

The British Health Service—How "socialized medicine" really works. 28pp. 25¢

Toward Nationalization of Industry—The arguments for public control of utilities, natural resources etc. by Dr. Laidler. 32pp. 25¢

Labor Abroad

World Labor Today, 1945-52—a unique guide to post war labor movements. 56pp. 35¢

British Labor as Government and as Opposition—1945-50 examined to show what the Labor Party did in and out of office. 40pp. 25¢.

The

S.L.I.D. VOICE

National Newsletter of the Student League for Industrial Democracy

Published by the National Office—Student League for Industrial Democracy, 112 East 19th Street, New York 3, N. Y.

490

Issue of

"THE SILENT GENERATION SPEAKS" SLID'S WISCONSIN INSTITUTE

SLID will hold a conference this summer in Madison, Wisconsin from July 7 through 13. SLID's chapter at the University of Wisconsin, the Liberal Club, will play host. Topic: The Silent Generation Speaks.

But perhaps we should not call this a "topic" in the normal sense of the word. After all, the "silent" generation has been one of the foremost topics of conversation in the last few years. Much has been said about it that is silly, much that is perceptive. But we are not meeting in Madison to say either silly or intelligent things about our generation qua generation.

Mr. Otto Butz has said a few things about us in his book, "The Unsilent Generation." He has tried to demonstrate, through the publication of several extended interviews with some rather self-centered collegians, that in fact our generation was not silent at all but rather a talkative bunch. Now this hardly needs demonstration. But Mr. Butz went further and equated talk with concern. And while it might be true that an increased amount of talk is a covert indication of some kind of concern, nevertheless, Mr. Butz's collegians demonstrated few of the concerns which we in SLID value.

Now while we may be able to see that

the concerns of Mr. Butz's college boys are not our concerns, it becomes more difficult to specify exactly what our concerns are, why we share them, and what to what particular problems they are to be applied today. There are of course a few problems which everyone recognizes. The segregation-integration issue is one of these. But what can we as students do to help in working out the problem? This is a question which has not been answered because it has not been asked. We will ask it in Madison.

There are a few conspicuous problems such as desegregation which recur constantly. But there are others, perhaps equally important, which tend to be ignored. Mr. Butz's students believe on the whole that social action is futile, that the control of our future is out of our own hands and rests in the huge impersonal forces of Society and State. This attitude is in itself a serious problem to us, for it tends to make a frustrating situation more permanent. It then becomes our job to evaluate the claims of this quietistic position, to discover if there really are areas in which student action can be effective.

In order to avoid feelings of being rushed during the conference, eight sessions will be spread out over a week,

thus allowing plenty of time for vacationing, parties, and meeting people in an informal way. The first few discussions will be informal, designed to bring into focus as many of our concerns as possible in a limited span of time. Summaries of the discussions will be printed each day. The particular questions upon which the later discussions will concentrate will be determined by the decision of the conferees. These later discussions will be led by various eminent men, names of which will be announced later. These men will be selected on the basis of their having concerns similar to ours, and of their versatility in a number of different fields.

We have reached the point, it seems where the old frames of reference, the old vocabularies, are simply no longer suited to the analysis and solution of today's problems. We must make an intensive and deliberate effort in the next few years to devise some new approach. There is an urgency about this. Problems are growing larger; without an intelligent and concerned group of young people today, it will be difficult to avert a major catastrophe tomorrow. There is no better way of going about our reformulation than through an honest examination of our own desires and objectives. The Madison conference is designed to be a first step in such an examination. In Madison will perhaps emerge the more honest voice of the "Silent" generation—a powerful voice which speaks not of selfish objectives alone.

Tape recordings will be made of all proceedings. Transcripts of the discussions will be used at subsequent SLID conferences to facilitate a continuity of discourse on the questions which come up. Needless to say, those who are not free to come to Madison for the entire week will be welcomed at any time during the Institute.

CHAPTER ACTIVITIES

Columbia

A chapter discussion was held on May 7 on the topic, "The Case for Modern Man," using as a point of departure the book by Prof. Charles Frankel of the same name. Starting with Mr. Frankel's conclusion that although the 19th century idea of automatic progress is no longer completely valid today, nevertheless modern-day liberalism must be founded on some notion of progress as a dynamic motivating force, the discussion quickly turned to the question of means: whether frankness and ideological integrity or political expediency is the best way to further the growth of a liberal movement.

Yale

The Yale John Dewey Society finished its Spring discussion series with three interesting meetings. On April 22 the Society heard Mr. Victor Brombert of the French department discuss the historical relation of the French intellectual to political movements. On April 29, Mr. T.Y. Li of the Chinese department discussed "Native Chinese Elements in Chinese Communism," concluding that such native elements truly existed, and that in them there might be the basis of a future break with the Soviet Union. On May 5 the chapter participated in a discussion with Sidney Hertzberg about the work of the L.I.D. and SLID, and about the future course of the liberal in America.

CHAPTER ELECTIONS

Columbia announces the election of the following officers for 1958-59: President—Jack Rennerts; Vice-pres.—John Burr; Sec'y—Tom Johnson; Treasurer—Lee R. Brooks.

SPRING CONFERENCE ON FOREIGN POLICY

Ithaca, N.Y. was the scene of a SLID conference on United States Foreign Policy, held on the weekend of April 25-27. The Cornell Forum was host to several SLID members from New York and Massachusetts. The three sessions were addressed by Mr. Mario Einaudi and Mr. Edward Fox, of the Government and History departments, respectively, and by Mr. Sidney Hertzberg of the L.I.D.

The talks of Mr. Einaudi and Mr. Fox, both on European affairs, centered around various aspects of the proposals set forth by George Kennan in his recent Reith lectures. Mr. Einaudi spoke mainly in support of Kennan's plan for military disengagement in Eastern and Central Europe. Arguing that such a plan would do much in the direction of reducing tensions in that area, he went further and examined some of the concrete details of the problem. Mr. Einaudi concluded that the minimal first step towards military disengagement would be the establishment of a zone in Eastern and Central Europe free of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Fox also supported Kennan's disengagement proposal, but he disagreed strongly with the Kennan approach to the German question. Re-unification, he argued, is only justifiable in terms of nationalistic sentiment, and this sentiment Mr. Fox believes to be dangerous to the cause of world unity and peace. He cited two areas in which reunified and neutral Germany might be a menace: First, in its relations with Eastern Europe, especially Poland, where boundary disputes of long standing might easily erupt into a major war. Second, in Germany's relations to the Western World; a united Germany might see fit to withdraw from the European Common Market, thus delivering a crippling blow to West European unity.

Mr. Fox also deplored the rise of nationalist movements in the Middle East and Asia, on the ground that such move-

badly needed internationalism. A good deal of controversy was aroused when the speaker advocated Algerian autonomy only in the context of NATO or a unified Western European economic system. He also strongly criticized Mr. Dulles' actions at the time of the Suez crisis, on the grounds that the latter's approach endangered the solidity of the Western alliance.

Sidney Hertzberg, Executive Director of the L.I.D., at the final session of the Conference, covered some areas that had not been mentioned and commented on others that had been mentioned. He agreed that nationalism was a force for evil in some parts of the world. However, he added, the achievement of political sovereignty was a phase that the peoples of Asia and Africa were bound to go through. He felt that Western nations had no choice but to help these peoples achieve independence, economic well-being, and democracy. This could often best be done, he said, through the United Nations.

N.Y. SUMMER FORUM

The first in a series of summer forums will be held at 8:30 PM on Friday, June 20, at the home of Adelaide Schulkind, 24 Washington Square North. The speaker will be Jay Sorenson, former education Vice-President, who will tell of his recent experiences in the Soviet Union as part of an NSA delegation of student editors. Refreshments will be served.

SLID CONVENTION

Our annual convention will be held in New York on Saturday, Sept. 13 and Sunday, Sept. 14. All members of SLID are entitled to come as delegates; it is hoped that some of the new Midwestern chapters will be represented. The National Office will assist in arranging of car-pools for those coming from a distance, and will do its best to supply housing in New York.